

RECEIVED

- 6/6/59 1. Extracts from "Un-American Activities"
- 5/27/59 2. Letter to [redacted] from the John Birch Society.
- 7/5/59 3. Booklet entitled "The Life of John Birch."
- 9/6/59 4. Petition entitled "Committee Against Communist Entanglements."
- 9/4/59 5. Flyer entitled "Just a minute, Mr. Congressman."
- 9/16/59 6. Booklet entitled "The Hearst Board."
- 9/4/59 7. Letter dated 6/29/59 on letterhead of "American Opinion" to [redacted]
- 9/16/59 8. Letter to [redacted] dated 7/16/59.
- 9/16/59 9. Letter dated 7/2/59 from Robert Welch to [redacted]
- 9/14/59 10. John Birch Society Bulletin for July.
- 9/14/59 11. Memo on letterhead of John Birch Society 7/4/59.
- 9/14/59 12. Form entitled "Application for Membership."

Referral/Consult

Date Recd. 1/9/59

From...

[Redacted]

(Address of contributor)

NY NY
(Address of contributor)

By

St. Pierre

(Name of Special Agent)

To Be Returned

Yes ()

No (X)

Description

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

100-32899-1A(1)

THE POLITICIAN

From the desk of
ROBERT WELCH

To put a final word at the beginning, let me explain that this document started as a letter to a friend. While it has now outgrown that format, the whole manuscript has still been written in that same spirit.

In other words, I do not try to prove anything, nor to marshal adequate evidence for either a court of law or the court of public opinion. My purpose is simply to tell a very limited number of patriotic Americans and good friends what I believe about certain aspects of our present situation, and to give some of the reasons for my belief.

Please note, too, that this version of this manuscript was finished last June, and that these copies were made by offset in August. It has not been brought up to date since that time, even though more recent developments further and strongly support its central argument.

Dear Reader:

This is not a book. It has not been published. It has not been offered for publication, nor intended for private publication by the writer.

This is an unfinished manuscript. A first and far shorter draft was completed in December, 1954, and shown to about thirty of my best-informed friends. A much longer version was finished in August, 1956, and has been read by perhaps sixty friends. This is a third, but by no means final, form of the composition. Its typewritten pages have been reproduced by a photo-offset process, and put together in this loose-leaf binder, solely for the convenience of those who are asked to read it.

Such friends, of whom you are one, have been very carefully selected -- for reasons which will become obvious. Each copy of the manuscript is numbered, and this is No. 52. I am asking you to consider it as on loan to you, for your own eyes only, until it is returned. I hope you will consider the contents as strictly confidential, and will use precaution to keep the manuscript safeguarded while it is in your possession. But I shall not ask for it back in a hurry, because if anything happens to me I should like to have a goodly number of copies safely out in other hands.

Fully aware of the pressures on your time, I am nevertheless pleading with you to take enough of that time to read all of these pages carefully and without undue haste. Not only I, but other men of far more influence and achievement (whose names are known

to you but should not be mentioned here), believe that you will consider this to be the most important manuscript or book you have ever read. This is not at all because of any skill or special knowledge or authority on my part. It is because of the importance -- to you, to your family, and to your country -- of the facts themselves which have been assembled here for your consideration.

Except in Chapter I (the accuracy of which I am willing to guarantee), there is no information in these pages which has not already been widely published elsewhere. My undertaking has been merely to put together the various pieces, as they fit into one clear pattern, in order to make more obvious the frightening significance of the total picture.

Besides my main purpose, of calling to your attention the real import of this picture as I see it, there is one other reason for sending you the manuscript. The possibility cannot be ignored that ever-worsening circumstances may, at some future time, make advisable the publication of a book based on this material. Against that possibility I welcome, and shall greatly appreciate, any corrections of error, additions of significantly relevant fact, or criticisms or suggestions of any kind, you may be able and willing to give me.

Sincerely,

Robert L. Sherr

INTRODUCTION

It is difficult for many of us to remember just what the score was, in the Cold War, only five years ago. So a brief review of the situation at that time may be helpful.

Joseph Stalin died on March 5, 1953. During the spring and summer of 1953 his death was a recent and most important event. Lavrenti Beria was still alive, to contest with Georgi Malenkov for dictatorial power. Affairs in the Kremlin were more unsettled than they had been since the purges of 1937. And throughout the world a fermenting doubt was at work as to whether Malenkov or anybody else would be able to establish the firm and efficient control over International Communism that had been exercised by Stalin.

The preponderant weight of evidence, on the authority of those best informed about the subject, was that the Russians had not yet produced even one atom bomb for themselves. The few they had obtained for demonstration and prestige purposes had been assembled by them out of parts stolen from our plants. Even Harry Truman had subscribed to this view, in January, 1953, on the basis of all the knowledge that had been available to him as President. The Russians, while proceeding with their usual bluff and bluster, simply did not yet have any nuclear weapons.

General Van Fleet was in position to inflict a devastating defeat on the Chinese Communists in Korea. He himself has stated that, as late as April, 1953, he and the South Koreans could have won an overwhelming victory, and should have been allowed to do so. Chiang Kai-shek had half a million soldiers on Formosa, straining at the leash to go back to the

mainland -- either independently, or as our allies in Korea.

Japan had not yet been infiltrated by Communist influences as it has today. Ramon Magsaysay was in the very process of completely routing the Communists in the Philippines. Ho Chi Minh was still having plenty of troubles with his civil war in Vietnam. Sukarno had not yet dared show his completely Communist hand in Indonesia. In Ceylon, extremely important as a base for any small wars around the perimeter of Asia, the United National Party was still in control; its dominant figure, Sir John Kotelawala (to become Premier in October, 1953) was vigorously pro-Western and anti-Communist.

There were no strategically serious Communist advances yet in Africa. (Gamal Abdel Nasser was still a lieutenant-colonel; he became Vice-Premier of Egypt, under President Nguib, on June 18, 1953.) The Middle East, except for little Israel, was still firmly anti-Communist. Turkey had shown her willingness actually to fight the Communists, by the troops she had sent to Korea. Greece was at that time solidly in the anti-Communist camp. So was Italy, with the Christian Democrats still in control. England had thrown out the left-wing socialists and had a Tory government which, except for Anthony Eden, was at least a little bit awake to the Communist threat. West Germany had staged a remarkable recovery, and was taking the lead in trying to establish the anti-Communist European Defense Community. The enslaved people in Poland, in the Balkans, in all of the satellites, were as resentful and smoldering as they have ever been. The East Germans arose in the most determined and dangerous uprising the Kremlin ever had to face. The suicidal rebellion at the huge Vorkuta slave labor camps showed the inflammable conditions inside Russia itself. There

were a dozen fuses waiting to be lighted, and some already lighted which had to be stamped out in a hurry, all leading to charges of dynamite within the foundations of Soviet power.

The American government had saved the Soviet regime from financial collapse in 1933, and given its prestige and credit the vital hypodermic injection, by recognition. The American government had saved the Soviet regime from destruction by Hitler's armies, in 1942 and 1943, through intervention with both supplies and military force. The American government had made possible all of the postwar expansion of the Soviet empire, by acquiescence and frequently by collaboration in the Soviet subjugation of other nations. But in the spring of 1953 the American people were no longer in a mood to condone such a partnership. The American people had begun to wake up to the extent of Communist infiltration into our government and into every segment of our public life. They were, at long last, realizing the crime of "containment" and the folly of appeasement. And without the American government to hold over the Kremlin the umbrella of its protection, against storms rising on every side, the Kremlin faced a very precarious future. Not since the siege of Stalingrad had the whole Communist tyranny been in so much danger of being wiped off the face of the earth.

The sad truth is that this tyranny was actually saved, in this period of great vulnerability, by just one thing; by the inauguration, on January 20, 1953, of Dwight David Eisenhower as President of the United States. The circumstances of his election made it politically necessary for him to bring many good men into his government. The rationale of his election, and the temper of the American people, made it imperative for a while that he talk a good brand of anti-Communism. But the Communist influences

which completely controlled him kept the reins of that control tight and effective. Subtly, cleverly, always proclaiming otherwise and finding specious excuses for what were really pro-Communist actions, these Communist influences made him put the whole diplomatic power, economic power, and recognized leadership of this country to work, on the side of Russia and the Communists, in connection with every problem and trouble spot in their empire. You only have to look at where we stand today, five years later, at exactly these same spots on the scoreboard reviewed above, to realize the truth of this assertion and the extent of this Communist success. It simply was not possible to lose so much ground, so rapidly, to an enemy so inferior, by chance or by stupidity. The explanation calls for a very sinister and hated word, but one which is by no means new in the history of governments or of nations. The word is treason. It is the province of this treatise to show the part played in these treasonous developments, however unwittingly or unwillingly, by Dwight Eisenhower; and how, as the most completely opportunistic and unprincipled politician America has ever raised to high office, he was so supremely fitted for the part.

CHAPTER ONE

The Lieutenant Colonel

The Olympic Hotel in Seattle is a massive stone building, with a huge old-fashioned main dining room that has been a treat to this weary traveler, and to thousands like him, on many occasions over many years. Nevertheless, in 1940 the Olympic Hotel badly needed business. Early that fall the manager hit upon a gesture of hospitality which he thought might serve as bait to bring in more customers. He was after, specifically, more patronage from the younger officers of the rapidly increasing U. S. Army forces at nearby Ft. Lewis. And he believed that if the colonels made The Olympic their social headquarters, the lieutenants would surely follow.

So the hotel manager telephoned a colonel with whom he had recently been on a fishing trip. He invited this gentleman to bring three or four other officers besides himself to dinner, in the manager's four-room apartment in the hotel. The colonel accepted. One of the officers he took along for the evening was a lieutenant colonel, by the name of Dwight D. Eisenhower. The only other guests were John Boettiger and his wife, the former Anna Roosevelt Dall, daughter of President Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Anna's place in her father's affections, and influence over him, were well known at that time. As soon as Lt. Colonel Eisenhower saw Mrs. Boettiger, and realized who she was, he asked to be seated next to her at dinner. Before dinner, during dinner, and after dinner, he monopolized her attention. They conversed together throughout the evening, to the visible

exclusion of the others present. But much of their conversation, naturally and necessarily, was overheard. And the burden of Ike's song for hour on hour was the greatness of Franklin D. Roosevelt. In telling the daughter how wonderful her father was, the lieutenant colonel managed to cover with fulsome praise practically all the words and works of the President.

Early the next morning Anna was on the telephone to her father in Washington. "I've found the man," she said. And she proceeded to tell the abnormally vain FDR what a hero-worshipper of his, and what a genius, she had discovered in an army uniform. Within a few days -- although the incident is completely and understandably ignored in Ike's own account of this period, in his ghost-written autobiography, Crusade In Europe -- Lt. Colonel Eisenhower was ordered to Washington for an interview in the White House.

A few weeks later Eisenhower, back at Ft. Lewis, was made Chief of Staff of the 3rd Infantry Division. Four months later, in March of 1941, he became Colonel Eisenhower, and was made Chief of Staff of the whole Ninth Army Corps. In June he was made Chief of Staff of the United States Third Army, with headquarters at San Antonio. There, in his own language, he "was brought closer to the problems of the Army of the United States as a whole." At the end of September, of that same year of 1941, he became a brigadier general. Five days after Pearl Harbor, or on December 12, 1941, he was called to Washington by telephone, in advance of written orders, by Walter Bedell Smith, who was conveying instructions from General George C. Marshall.

Brigadier General Eisenhower met General Marshall in Washington on December 14, and was immediately brought into war planning at the highest

level. On February 16, 1942 he was made Assistant Chief of Staff of the War Plans Division. On March 9, as the War Plans Division was replaced by the OPD -- Operations Division of the War Department General Staff -- Eisenhower became its first head, with the rank of Major General. On June 11 he was given command of our "European Theatre of Operations"; and soon "fell into the habit" of having luncheon with Winston Churchill at 10 Downing Street every Tuesday, and dinner with Churchill at the latter's home every Thursday. In July, 1942 he was given the three stars of a lieutenant general. On February 11, 1943, less than two years from the time when he had still been a lieutenant colonel, Eisenhower became a full general. And ten months later, although he had never been in combat command of even a battalion, and had never seen a battle, General Eisenhower was made Commander in Chief of all the Allied forces in Western Europe.

We do not wish to imply, however, that this meteoric rise was due entirely to the exercise of Eisenhower's flattering charm on Anna Roosevelt Boettiger, nor even to the personal favoritism of her father which he thereby obtained. There were more comprehensive forces at work. The first of these was the overall and continuous brilliance of Dwight D. Eisenhower as a politician. This aptitude (which included some unsavory tricks for self-promotion at the expense of his associates and superiors) had already been well utilized, to give him the nebulous but profitable reputation of being "an outstanding officer." For Eisenhower is not only all politician, so far as his ability is concerned. He is the living embodiment of practically all of the skills and attitudes that every ambitious politician would like to possess.

His most obvious asset in political maneuvers

is the personal charm to which we have already referred. Few men have ever exemplified more conclusively Shakespeare's wise observation that "one may smile, and smile, and be a villain." Woodrow Wilson, for all the subtlety of his skill as a politician, lacked this characteristic of disarming self-ingratiation, which Franklin Roosevelt found so useful and which Eisenhower has made even more so.

But Eisenhower is more like Wilson, and goes far beyond him, in the second asset of his inventory -- which is the successful pretense of not being a politician at all. Here is, in plain and completely provable fact, the "big lie"; the lie so big, and so exactly the opposite of the truth, that it simply does not occur to most people to examine it, as possibly a lie, at all. La Rochefoucauld said: "It is a great cleverness to know how to conceal one's cleverness." With regard to his political cleverness Eisenhower has performed this feat in the style of a master.

The General's contribution towards winning World War II, for instance, was important; but it was entirely that of a political "fixer." Whether working with (or on) Darlan and DeGaulle, or smoothing out frictions and disagreements between the British and American chiefs of staff, his skill was so great that even Alanbrooke said that "we, as allies, were extremely fortunate to have such a charming individual. As Supreme Commander what he may have lacked in military ability he greatly made up for by the charm of his personality." Actually, Eisenhower was so poor at strategy, tactics, and the necessary qualifications for military command that even his unceasing sponsor, George Marshall, once cabled him in disgust that he was entirely too weak for the position which he held. He was, in fact, so indifferent a soldier that it became necessary for the top authorities to shunt him aside and upstairs, in such an ex-

alted position that he had only political considerations to which to devote his energy and time, in order that the real soldiers under him could get on with their campaigns and the business of winning the war. And yet he came out of the war, and took a place in the American public mind, as a great soldier; a man who had won the war by his superb military generalship; and a man so completely naive in politics that he didn't even know what was happening, in the gigantic build up of himself for the presidency. So firmly and cleverly was this reputation established that not even after five years of Eisenhower as President, during which time he has continuously engaged in far more dirty, more deceptive, and more ruthless behind-the-scenes political manipulations than even Roosevelt ever undertook, have the American people begun to see the politician in the uniform of a soldier or under the silk hat of the statesman.

So, returning to the discussion of Eisenhower's rise in four years from being an unknown lieutenant colonel to becoming the Supreme Commander of the largest military force ever organized, with dozens of the very ablest generals of Europe and America under him, there are those -- even among his most severe critics -- who attribute this fantastic ascent entirely to his charm and political genius; to the same consciously employed smoothness that hypnotized Anna Roosevelt and her father, and started Ike on his way. And of course they could be right. But we think these critics are entirely too optimistic, too generous, and too blind to other influences which were sweeping him along.

We believe that some very sinister but powerful forces had already put their mark on Eisenhower as a pliable tool of the future; that they recognized in him a politician who, for personal promotion and prestige and glory, would always be willing to sail

before the winds they created and to keep his compass pointed in the direction they desired. And we believe not only that these forces were already helping the advancement of his career, at every turn, but that this conclusion can be convincingly substantiated by a careful enough study of the record.

We agree that the dinner in Seattle was extremely fortunate for Eisenhower and his promoters; and that this opportunity to reveal himself to one of the Roosevelt clan as so kindred a spirit was important. But we also think that if this propitious opening had not occurred, he or his behind-the-scenes manipulators would have invented one which served almost as well. While it is probable that Roosevelt's sheer favoritism, once gained and held by the Eisenhower flattery and charm, might alone have put Eisenhower in a major-general's uniform before the war was over, we think it took those sinister forces, of which Roosevelt himself was a half willing but never quite conscious captive, to parlay the Eisenhower winnings into so grand -- and useful -- a final prize. And we think this fact is the key to much of the tragic history of the last fifteen years.

CHAPTER TWO

"Lucky Ike"

For, let's go back to December 12, 1941. It was only the preceding Sunday that General George C. Marshall had woefully failed to use the telephone, or any other prompt means, to give General Short and Admiral Kimmel in Hawaii his own advance information as to the coming Japanese attack. Half of the American fleet had been deliberately decoyed as sitting ducks in Pearl Harbor, with Marshall's full knowledge and connivance, to induce the Japanese to strike. So afraid were he and Roosevelt that the Hawaiian commanders might somehow learn in advance of Japanese intentions that they had even denied these commanders the possession of a "Purple" decoding machine, through which they themselves might have learned at first hand what was afoot. And while Roosevelt was equally guilty with Marshall of this particular piece of deliberate treason, I believe that the history of the two men and of the period will show a huge difference in motives. Roosevelt, being swept along and used by Communist forces which he thought he was using, avid for the glory and the power of being a wartime president and of tossing around millions of men and billions of dollars with a nod of his head, dreaming of accomplishing what Wilson had tried but failed to do, seeing himself sometime in the future as the world-worshipped hero who had saved it for democracy and perhaps even united it under his own leadership; Roosevelt thus saw the coming loss at Pearl Harbor as a worthwhile gambit for the sake of getting us into the war through a blow struck first

by an enemy.

It was criminal. In fact, it was treason. But getting the enemy to strike first, in a war that seems inevitable, is nothing new in the history of nations. Those who would condone it can point to precedents in the past. And there are plenty of intelligent and otherwise patriotic Americans today who, recognizing and admitting everything we have stated above, still claim that Roosevelt was justified in making this calculated sacrifice in order to unite the country at once in wartime effort against enemies who sought to destroy it. We vigorously disagree, but they have at least an understandable argument.

George Marshall's purpose, however, in our opinion, was not to save his country, but to carry forward Communist plans which would ultimately deliver it to Communism. His immediate goal was to get America into the war, at any cost, in order to relieve Stalin from the terrible pressure of the German armies. It was Japan who attacked us, but Marshall headed the necessary strength and influence which caused us to throw all of our gathering war might against Germany -- or in the form of supplies and armament directly to the aid of the Russians. It was Marshall who insisted on our launching an immediate landing and second front in France, even in 1942, at whatever cost; and who kept on so insisting, even after the British had shown everybody else enough of the facts of life about crossing the Channel at that time to make the idea obviously absurd. Alanbrooke even charges that Marshall didn't have the slightest plan as to what Allied troops would do, if and after any of them actually landed in France, or even as to which way they should try to go. This may be inaccurate or exaggerated. But it was prompted by Marshall's clamorous demand for a second front at once. The British, and even most of the American generals

primarily George Marshall and Dwight D. Eisenhower, who were deliberately and consciously serving the interests of Russia rather than their own country, the puzzle would have disappeared like an exploded soap bubble. And it made no difference that some of these men were not traitors for the sake of treason, but only opportunistic politicians who knew where the real control of future events lay and by which side their bread was buttered.

Let's look next at another tremendous boost given the Russian Communist plans by Eisenhower, for which he justifiably took some of the credit in 1948, but which he undoubtedly would prefer to disclaim today. This was the instigation and early implementation of the so-called Morgenthau Plan for the conversion of Germany into a goat pasture -- so that it could never stand as a bulwark against the eventual Russian march across Europe. But for the foresight, patriotism, and determination of just one man, James Forrestal (whom the Communists later, either directly or indirectly, murdered), Eisenhower and his Communist pushers would have succeeded in carrying out the complete and final devastation which they planned.

The egg of the Morgenthau Plan was laid during a discussion of Germany's future, which took place at Eisenhower's English headquarters, in August, 1944. In Crusade in Europe Eisenhower (or his Communist ghost writer, Joseph Barnes) says that the discussion arose because of the visit of Secretary Morgenthau. But even in 1948 Mr. Barnes was careful not to have Eisenhower mention that Harry Dexter White and John G. Winant were also present at the meeting. As to primary responsibility for the plan, however, we can save a lot of rambling to assemble evidence by simply quoting Fred Smith, former Assistant to Secretary of the Treasury, Henry Mergen-

and ably, however sad their hearts, in American uniform as American soldiers against the Japanese armies. But for Japan to have treated any of these Japanese, who were captured in American uniform, as anything but regular prisoners of war, would have been unthinkable under international law. For us to have entered into some agreement with Japan when the war was over to turn over to that country, for torture and death, any of these Japanese who had served in our uniform in our armies, would have been incredible. So Vlasov certainly had reason to hope and believe that he and his men would be accorded the civilized treatment of uniformed prisoners of war; especially since everything that had happened at Yalta was then still as secret as the grave.

On the way to the redoubt in Austria the First ROA Division, under General Bunichenko, sidestepped enough to march to Prague. At that time Patton's forces, which had reached Pilsen, fifty miles away, had been pulled back about fifty miles by Eisenhower's orders (on the excuse later given that he couldn't spare the gasoline for them to march fifty miles forward), in order to allow the Russians under Marshall Koniev to take the city. The inhabitants had revolted against the Germans, the departing Nazis had set fire to the city, and sheer horror prevailed. Bunichenko's division arrived, restored order on May 6, 7, and 8, and slipped away as Koniev's troops came in. Having learned in Prague that Eisenhower intended to let Russian troops occupy all of Czechoslovakia, General Bunichenko marched his ROA First Division westward until they reached the nearest American forces, and surrendered his twenty-five thousand men to the United States 3rd Army on May 10, 1945. The division was then forcibly disarmed, and compelled by United States tanks to march into the hands of the Red Army which was waiting for

two million victims were involved, and the whole operation was of tremendous importance to postwar Europe, the book tries to gloss the story over in less than three pages of humanitarian generalities. (They are Pages 484-486 in the 1952 paperbound PermaBooks edition.) And these two and one-half pages are a tissue of deliberate and direct lies. Just for one illustration, Eisenhower says on Page 485: "These policies and agreements (he is trying to blame Yalta, but is actually admitting he made the decisions) we first tried to apply without deviation, but we quickly saw that their rigid application would often violate the fundamental humanitarian principles we espoused. Thereafter we gave any individual who objected to return the benefit of the doubt."

I have in front of me, as I now write, a photostatic copy of Part II of an order issued from "Supreme Headquarters, Allied Expeditionary Force," dated "Revised May 1945," and entitled "Guide To The Care Of Displaced Persons in Germany." Part II, Section 3, Heading 1, Paragraph 3 of that order says: "After identification by Soviet Repatriation Representatives, Soviet displaced persons will be repatriated regardless of their individual wishes." Another paragraph of that same order reads: "Enemy and ex-enemy displaced persons, except those assimilated to United Nations status, will be returned to their countries of nationality or former residence without regard to their personal wishes." These orders continued in effect, without any interruption until August, when General Patch raised his question; and then were confirmed by our Joint Chiefs of Staff, even as to the specific use of force, as soon as Eisenhower became a member and could put his influence to work. And both he and Joseph Barnes were well aware of these facts, when they wrote the falsehoods indicated above for publication in 1948.

large as it is among educators. So it may well be that turning the eyes of the American public away from any good look at this quietly dangerous development was as important, in the minds of Eisenhower and his bosses, as the more specific immediate purpose.

As to the Army-McCarthy hearings probably little needs to be said here. That the whole factitious proceeding was cooked up inside the White House was revealed in the hearings themselves. That Secretary Stevens had originally intended to cooperate with McCarthy, gladly and diligently, in weeding traitors out of the Army, was obvious. It was equally obvious that he gradually changed, under pressure from the White House, until in the hearings themselves he perjured himself openly and brazenly with full White House approval. A very able and patriotic U. S. Army General, Kirk Lawton, found that he had sacrificed his career by merely doing his patriotic duty in trying to help to expose the Communists under his command at Fort Monmouth. Lawton was relieved of command and retired, not just to satisfy the vengeance of George Marshall and Dwight Eisenhower, but as another warning to those Army officers who might want to emulate his brand of patriotism. All of the artificial storm and fury, from which you might have thought -- and were supposed to think -- that McCarthy had committed every crime in the book from arson to treason, eventually boiled down to the question of a censure motion against McCarthy for language and methods supposedly unbecoming a senator. The censure motion was itself written, down to the last word and comma, by agents of the Communist-loaded National Committee For An Effective Congress, and was introduced by a former supporter of the Morgenthau Plan and the Nuremberg trials, a foul-mouthed Senator named Ralph Flanders, whose own language and methods

Party weekly. And to show you the kind of man Birkhead and Stout felt sure they were honoring, let me point out that among others who have been recipients of the same award are Roger Baldwin (who once publicly stated "Communism is the Goal"), with forty-two Communist-front citations in government files; and Norman Corwin, radio director for the United Nations, who has been officially cited sixty-eight times for his Communist-front affiliations.

In 1949 Eisenhower became a member of the board of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. This board had, very reluctantly, and because they could no longer flout public opinion so openly, accepted the resignation of Alger Hiss as president. They had elected as his successor Joseph Johnson, who had for years been the right-hand man of Hiss in our government. Then on December 12, 1949, this board, with Eisenhower now a member, passed a resolution deploring the "political pressure" being exerted on Dean Acheson for his defense of his friend Hiss. Eisenhower did not follow the leads of his good friends Acheson and Frankfurter, in serving as a character witness for Hiss, probably because his presence in Europe during the period of Hiss' most important activities would have kept the testimony from being of sufficient value. But in November, 1949, he did go out of his way personally to vouch for the loyalty of Philip Jessup, in a telegram to the McCarran Committee, when that committee was investigating the smelly activities of Jessup in the Institute of Pacific Relations.

It was as president of Columbia University, however, that Eisenhower got in some of his most effective blows for the cause. Best known of these was his acceptance of the grant, from the Communist puppet government of Poland, of thirty thousand dollars as an endowment for a "Chair of Polish Studies." He was

already been such a haven for Communist professors and center of Communist influence, Eisenhower would neither have wanted, nor been offered, the job of being its president. Certainly he left it more Communist-slanted than he found it. At one time he was given a list of eighty-seven people on his faculty who had records of affiliation with Communist or Communist front activities. Some of them undoubtedly were just dupes. But among them were such notorious, persistent, and industrious workers in the Communist cause as Walter Rautenstrauch, Dorothy Brewster, Bernard J. Stern, Mark Van Doren, Gene Weltfish, Robert S. Lynd, Corliss Lamont, Leslie C. Dunn, Abraham Edel, Paul F. Brissenden, Phillip Klein, Harry Grundfest, Ernest J. Simmons, Boris M. Stanfield, Donald G. Tewkesbury, Edith F. Clallin, and Goodwin Watson.

For any organization to be officially classified by government agencies as a Communist front, then as now, the evidence had to be conclusive -- and practically blinding. Yet at that time the first five names on this list already had citations in government files for participation in 62, 38, 31, 19, and 33 Communist fronts, respectively. Stern, under an assumed name, had written a Marxist book put out by the official publishing subsidiary of the Communist Party. Miss Weltfish had been president of one organization classified by the U. S. Department of Justice as Communist. And so it went, not only with these five but with others named. Just for one more illustration, the pro-Communist activities of Goodwin Watson, the last name on the list above, filled sixty-four pages in the Congressional Record. All of these facts and full information concerning all of those listed were supplied to General Eisenhower.

It was not easy to do. At all times he angrily denied and aggressively resisted any implication that

our "occupying" forces, both civilian and military, lord it over the natives of the countries where they are stationed; and, as the very reason for their existence, go about telling the poor benighted natives what to do and how to lead their lives. (In 1955, for instance, we spent nine hundred thousand dollars in Turkey, organizing and setting up labor unions -- which they had never had -- so that the Turks would have better industrial relations!)

The Kremlin-controlled Communist conspiracy is actually the most ambitiously imperialistic force that has ever come into existence on our planet. But a key maxim of Soviet policy is: Always accuse your opponent, first and loudly, of those very crimes which you yourself are committing. And since they realized they could never make us appear to anybody, for very long, as imperialists by the sword, they have steered us into becoming imperialists by the dollar. It is very easy for Russian agents and Russian propaganda to point to us as imperialists; to convince the natives everywhere that we are imperialists; and to get us hated and feared accordingly. For we have actually become imperialists, meddling in the lives, the economics, the politics, and the foreign policies, of almost every remaining country in the free world; and doing so as extensively, as obnoxiously, and almost as damagingly, as ever did a Caesar who had taken over such countries by the sword.

We even help the Communists' propaganda by giving them names on which to hang their charges. By adding a "Truman Doctrine" for Greece and Turkey and then an "Eisenhower Doctrine" for the Middle East to a once highly respected but now easily distorted Monroe Doctrine, we have appeared to intend ultimately to promulgate American "doctrines" which would definitely establish us as imperialist "protectors" of countries all over the world. Nothing could serve the Russian propaganda and psychological needs today

politics as a great and mighty power." An important member of Jackson's Council was Vaclav Majer, who had been minister for food under Prime Minister Gottwald. And the rest were all of the same stamp.

The actual broadcasting at Munich under Jackson's direction was in charge of Pavel Tigrid-Schoenfeld, a self-styled "former" Communist, who surrounded himself with Reds, and excluded every Czech patriot who had ever shown the slightest hostility to Communism. While back in the New York office, in charge of what might be called the "Czech desk," Jackson installed Ferdinand Peroutka, who had been a leading socialist advocate of Czech collaboration with the Communists before the Communists took over his country. Much of Peroutka's "fighting" of Communism from New York consisted of nasty remarks about Senator McCarthy, General MacArthur, and Senator Taft, to be broadcast in Europe. In his commentary broadcast from Munich on August 3, 1952, reporting the defeat of Senator Taft at the Republican Convention, Peroutka proclaimed, in appropriate English: "Already for a long time have we written no comments with such great joy." And that, my friends, was nothing compared to the usual stuff you were paying for with your money, to be broadcast over Radio Free Europe as a means of pushing back the Iron Curtain.

Perhaps we should give you a really fair sample, to confirm the above statement. The second country on C. D. Jackson's list for salvation was Hungary. His selection of collaborators, agents, and committee members for that operation was even worse than for Czechoslovakia, so we'll skip the details here. And this bunch of Communists and Communist-sympathizers really went to town. In fact the pro-Communism of their broadcasts was so blatant that in 1954 the West German government, catching several of the leaders out of the country simultaneously, refused to give them

to John S. Graham in the paragraph above.

31. Neil McElroy.

Secretary of Defense.

This is another step in the left-grading of the original cabinet. McElroy's only publicized contribution to the leftwing drive up to the time of his appointment -- that we know about -- was his chairmanship and handling of the White House Conference On Education. The technique known as "group dynamics" is completely a Communist technique, invented and developed by them as a clever means of manipulating the opinions within supposedly free-discussion democratic assemblages, so as to distill out of these gatherings exactly the opinions that the Communist planners wanted arrived at in the first place. McElroy made assured and brilliant use of this technique, in order to come up with a report from this conference favoring the federal government's getting both feet into public education, despite the clear record that the report did not represent the views of a majority of even the carefully selected pawns on this chess-board. So, as other better informed writers have already pointed out, there was reason to regard Mr. McElroy with considerable skepticism. And we can report, out of our own knowledge, that he was already so regarded by many of the outstanding conservative citizens of his home town of Cincinnati.

Since McElroy was made Secretary of Defense, he has shown his true colors much more emphatically. He has been an outspoken advocate of "changing our way of life" because of the Russian threat; that is, of regimenting our whole social organization under bureaucratic economic and political controls. This would impose on us exactly that form and degree of state socialism under an all-powerful central government, which the Communists are so anxious to bring about as a major step towards pulling a communized

to suggest any smelly skeletons in his rear. But there seldom is.

At any rate, Bunker is a life-long Democrat, who served as both Ambassador to Argentina, and then Ambassador to India, under Truman. Which may establish the only point really involved in his appointment. But being of a mean and suspicious nature, we cannot help mentioning at least one bag of bones which somebody found in his immaculate-looking closets. Mr. Bunker is, and for sometime has been, a member of the board of trustees of the Institute of International Education, Inc. A well-informed friend of mine says that describing the Institute as an actual branch of the Communist International, on the basis of the listing on Page 6 of The Communist Conspiracy, issued on May 29, 1956 by the House Un-American Activities Committee, is to make a too "dogmatic interpretation of a complicated relationship." Nor is there any question but that plain eggheaded liberals have found their stony-eyed way onto the Institute's board, as in the case of all other associations promoting one-worldism. But we confess to a strong prejudice against any organization of which Stephen Duggan and Ed Murrow have been the driving forces, and against any man who would accept their leadership.

33. Lawrence G. Derthick.

U. S. Commissioner of Education.

Derthick is a "liberal" Tennessee Democrat, and a close friend and protege of Senator Estes Kefauver. So we see no reason to gild the lily.

34. Gordon Gray.

Defense Mobilization Director.

Gray is a "liberal" North Carolina Democrat, who was considered "liberal" enough to have been acceptable as a successor to Frank Graham as president of the University of North Carolina. Actually we think that Gray, for all of his currently fashionable "liberal-

California primaries a couple of months ago 425,000 votes were cast for a known Communist as a candidate for an important state office!) Any conservative or anti-Communist politician in America today is having to face not only the honestly Democratic or "liberal" voters in his constituency, but a sizable bloc -- depending on the area -- of controlled votes that are not amenable to reason or arguments of any kind. That the Eisenhower State Department and its Immigration Service are deliberately and constantly increasing this bloc is common and public knowledge to everybody who has studied the plain facts. That Eisenhower personally is fully aware of this program, and is its chief supporter, is the plain fact that we wish to make clear here.

For six years Eisenhower and his associates have carried on a persistent and energetic campaign to break down the independent sovereignty of the United States, and to submerge that sovereignty under international agreements and the control of international agencies. The open boasts of the United Nations crowd -- as in the book, Revolution On East River, by James Avery Joyce -- that there is a day-by-day de facto surrender of American sovereignty to the UN, are well justified. And Eisenhower's support of this transfer of sovereignty by installments is continuous. He has emphasized over and over, for instance, that our troops are to be used, in implementation of the Eisenhower Doctrine, under the control of the United Nations Security Council.

In that Council we have one vote in eleven; Russia has a veto power over everything it doesn't like; and the United Nations Secretary for Security Council Affairs, who would have the most direct control of any such troops, has been either a Russian Communist or a Polish Communist ever since the United Nations

now are at least two-thirds of the way towards carrying out Lenin's strategy, and ruling the whole world. They are gaining speed and momentum fast. We are now the only real obstacle left in their way. And we have a Communist, or a politician who serves their purposes every bit as well, sitting right in the chair of the president of the United States.

Mr. Khrushchev was being cute, cautious, and clever when he said that our grandchildren would be living under socialism. Even that remark was meant to disarm us, by making the danger seem remote. If we do not wake up to the real facts fast, and wake up enough of our fellow citizens, it will be our children and ourselves living as enslaved subjects of the Kremlin -- possibly within five years, and certainly within ten to fifteen years at the very most. The danger is present, and it is very clear.

Two years ago I gave up my business responsibilities, and am now devoting "the whole of my life," without any pay or the expectation of remuneration of any kind, to efforts to wake up my fellow citizens to the horror and the imminence of the Communist danger. If you would like to help me to increase the reach and effectiveness of these efforts, there is a postscript to this manuscript which I shall be glad to send to any reader who requests it. **EW**

b6
b7c

Date Received

5/2/79

From

By

(Name of Special Agent)

To Be Returned

No

Description:

Letter to
from the John Birch
Society
File No. 100-32899-177

THE JOHN BIRCH SOCIETY

INCORPORATED

Belmont 78, Massachusetts

April 29, 1959



Dear [redacted]

b6
b7c

I am sorry it was not possible for you to attend the hearing of Mr. Welch's presentation in Dedham last Saturday. You will be interested to know that we have just made arrangements to have the tapes played again on Saturday, May 30, and I hope you will be able to hear them then. We will again be at the home of Dr. and Mrs. McKinney at 265 Walnut Street in Dedham, and the tapes will begin at 9:00 a.m.

The whole, integrated presentation requires six hours, and is most effective if heard at one time. It has been our custom to follow the same procedure in presenting the taped talk as was done the day the tapes were made - at the talk given here in Belmont on February 7th. So, we have a mid-morning coffee break and a buffet lunch, of course at no charge. In addition, there are light refreshments after the presentation while questions are being asked and, we trust, being satisfactorily answered. The gatherings usually break up around five or five-thirty. It requires an entire day to hear Mr. Welch's story, and he has condensed it as much as possible even at that. And yet everyone I know who has made this sacrifice of time has felt that it was a rewarding experience.

Less than four months ago, Mr. Welch, with the enthusiastic backing of a group of his sound Americanist friends, founded the John Birch Society for the purpose of attracting and banding together a few dedicated people in all parts of the country to promote more individual responsibility, less government and a better, more decent world. Mr. Welch's thirty years of actively fighting the inroads of socialism and communism wonderfully equipt him to head and direct such a body.

b6
b7c

The [redacted] local chapter of the John Birch Society which meets is the closest to you, and I would be delighted if you would come to the next meeting - at 8:00 p.m. on Thursday, May 7th. Of course, you would not have had the opportunity to get the background story by then, but you would be able to see what we look like and how we are trying to alert our friends and neighbors to the dangers most of them are unaware of and what measures we are taking to combat these dangers. You will be under no obligation of any kind, and will not be

dunned or asked to sign up for anything, though I hope you will want to get in the fight with us after you have seen and heard us.

Under separate cover I am sending you a copy of the Life of John Birch which Mr. Welch wrote in 1954, which will, among other things, let you know why we so honor the memory and life of this man. I am also sending reprints of recent articles which have appeared in Mr. Welch's monthly magazine, American Opinion, which you will find of interest.

I hope you will be able to hear the tapes and that you will be able to get to the meeting at my home on the 7th. We need to know a day before the tape playing how many to expect so that the proper amount of food can be provided, so take your time returning the enclosed card. If you have friends whom you believe would be interested in giving Mr. Welch a hearing, by all means bring them with you, but just let us know if so and how many. We are not interested in numbers per se, but we welcome any and all who will make the sacrifices.

[redacted]
[redacted] I am enclosing a very rough sketch of the location. We try to start promptly, and are usually through by 9:30. I hope I will have the opportunity to meet you there.

Sincerely yours,

[redacted]
Home Office, John Birch Society

b6
b7c

Date *11/5/9*

From..

By

(Name of Special Agent)

To Be Returned

Yes ()

No (*/*)

Description:

Books entitled
The Life of John Birch
File No. *100-32899-1A(3)*

50¢

THE *Life* OF
John Birch

*In the story of one American
boy, the ordeal of his age*

by

Robert H. W. Welch, Jr.



HENRY REGNERY COMPANY

Chicago • 1954

24.1959- 2:45 P.M.-

[redacted] called to say-
" he had my letter showing interest
in Commy fight and the taped ~~text~~
lecture given in [redacted] in Feb.,
as referred to by [redacted]

[redacted] in
[redacted] in Feb. and that this
taped lecture was to be given at
home of [redacted]

[redacted] at 9 A.M.
tomorrow, Sat.". Could I come?
I said I would try to make it.

b6
b7C

Date Received

8/31/59

From

Chicago office
(Name of contributor)

(Address of contributor)

By

(Name of Special Agent)

To Be Returned

Yes ()

No (X)

Description:

Petition entitled "Committee Against Communist Entry Laws"

File No.

100-32899-12(4)

These pocket petitions are issued by the

Committee Against Summit Entanglements

The Committee respectfully petitions the President of the United States not to attend a "summit conference" with the tyrants of the Kremlin, for the following reasons.

1. It will further increase Soviet prestige.
2. It will further discourage anti-Communists everywhere and weaken their will to resist.
3. It will play right into the hands of all of the appeasement-minded politicians, and weaken the position of the firm anti-Communist statesmen, in all the governmental circles of the remaining free world.
4. The results of the last "summit conference" have proved to be huge gains for the Soviets, and huge losses for the anti-Communist forces. We should be guided by this experience.
5. Experience has further and fully demonstrated that any agreements which the Soviets do make will be ignored or broken, as soon as it suits their convenience.
6. The only questions raised or discussed will be as to *how far* we will give in to Soviet demands. Under such conditions we have all to lose and nothing to gain.
7. The President of the United States is seriously handicapped, in bargaining in any such conference with a man like Khrushchev. The President's commitments are not final, but must later be ratified by the Senate, as is well known to the Soviet Premier, who can himself speak with dictatorial authority.
8. It is an unconstitutional way for an American President to conduct foreign affairs. Treaties must be entered into with the *advice and consent* of the Senate. Even if retroactive consent is later obtained, both Senate and Executive are violating the Constitution as to the *advice* of the Senate during the negotiations.
9. Syngman Rhee is correct that "what is morally wrong can never be politically right." It is morally wrong to fraternize with murderers.
10. And Jacques Soustelle is correct that, when dealing with the Soviets, always or on any issue, "to negotiate is to surrender."

These petitions will be mailed, postage prepaid at
20 for \$1.00 100 for \$3.00 1000 for \$20.00

For more petitions order from, and when each petition
is completed mail to

MR. ROBERT WELCH, *Chairman*

BELMONT 78, MASSACHUSETTS

Please, Mr. President, Don't Go

Name

Address

1.

2.

3.

4.

5.

6.

7.

8.

9.

10.

11.

12.

13.

14.

15.

16.

17.

18.

19.

20.

Date Received 8/31/59

From Chicago
(Name of contributor)

(Address of contributor)

By _____
(Name of Special Agent)

To Be Returned Yes ()
No (✓)

Description: Flyer entitled
"Just a Minute, Mr. Congressman"

File No. 100-32899-1a(5)

Just a minute,

Mr. Congressman, before YOU vote our money and our jobs away . . .

Within the next few weeks Congress must decide whether to continue the foreign aid program. The White House Crowd and the bureaucrats on the payroll of the State Department want it continued indefinitely.

They say it is good for us: they say that it prevents war, that it helps business and that it stops the spread of communism.

We say that it is bad for us: it cannot prevent war, it hurts business and it has completely failed to stop the spread of communism.

Mr. Congressman, YOU must side either with the bureaucrats or with the people back home who do all the work, who pay all the taxes and who cast the votes.

It may help if we give you just ONE specific example to show the fallacy, the failure and the injustice of the program.

1. The government in Washington, through its confiscatory income tax, seizes about one-third of the earnings of the American people.
2. The government in Washington uses this money to acquire most of the American cotton crop.
3. The government in Washington then sells this cotton to foreigners at several cents per pound less than American manufacturers can buy it back from their own government.
4. The government in Washington then permits foreign mills, paying but a fraction of American wages, to sell their products here at prices below the American cost of production. This unfair competition causes American mills to run short time or to close down.

Mr. Congressman, how does it help American factory employees to be put out of work?

How do these idled factories help American investors?

How does this transfer of jobs and payrolls to foreign lands help the storekeepers of America?

Then on top of all this, you have given the State Department bureaucrats the power to use our tax money to build new factories in "under-developed" lands to compete with us even further.

Read for yourself in the words of Nathaniel Rafler, a bureaucrat on the payroll of the State Department's International Cooperation Administration, how this bit of double-cross works:

"Confirming my comments of this morning, I wish to reiterate the International Cooperation Administration is prepared to render many forms of assistance to any one or more of your members who may be interested in establishing textile plants in Indonesia.

"International Cooperation Administration would be prepared to make loans from its New Development Fund. We would also be prepared to insure such investments against the political risks of expropriation, inconvertibility of currency, and war damage.

"Furthermore, we would furnish technical assistance by financing on-the-job training in Indonesia, or training here in America for Indonesians, in technical and managerial skill.

"We also might be able to finance the installation of public facilities such as power, transportation, etc., if not otherwise available."

For Heaven's sake, Mr. Congressman, did we send YOU to Washington to vote our jobs and our money away in this absurd attempt to reform and uplift the human race all over the world?

How can it stop other countries from going communist if Congress continues to vote America into bankruptcy, self-destruction and bureaucratic enslavement?

Since the end of the war, 72 billion tax dollars have been given away in all parts of the globe by an army of bureaucrats now numbering over 12,000.

From foreign-owned factories built with our gift dollars now comes a flood of manufactured articles that displace our goods, not only abroad, but here at home. For the first time since 1865 England sells us more than she buys from us. Day by day this displacement of our goods threatens American jobs and payrolls with contraction or extinction in the following industries, besides textiles:

Iron and steel
mill products

Pulp and paper
products

Fertilizer

Cement and other
non-metallic minerals

Non-ferrous metals
and products

Copper

Lumber and lumber
manufacturers

Machinery and
equipment

Motor vehicles

Engines and parts

Freight cars

To our fellow Americans: If you are opposed to the senseless transfer of American jobs and payrolls to foreign lands, then sign the following petition and mail a copy to your Congressman as well as a copy to each of your two Senators.

P E T I T I O N

Dear Mr. _____: I believe the first duty of the American government is to protect American citizens. I expect you to protect me by opposing the foreign aid program.

Name _____

Address _____

THE CITIZENS FOREIGN AID COMMITTEE
Suite 335, 1001 Connecticut Ave., N. W.
Washington, D. C.

CHAIRMAN, Mr. Walter Harnischfeger, Milwaukee, Wisconsin
Hon. T. Coleman Andrews, Richmond, Virginia
Hon. Spruille Braden, New York, New York
Mr. Frank C. Brophy, Phoenix, Arizona
Hon. Howard Buffet, Omaha, Nebraska
Mr. F. Cano Chance, Centralia, Missouri
Mr. Robert B. Dresser, Providence, Rhode Island
Mr. E. M. Elkin, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania
Hon. Guy George Gabrielson, Bernardsville, New Jersey
Mr. Luther O. Griffith, Huntington, West Virginia
Mr. Robert M. Harris, Forest Hills, New York
Mr. A. G. Heinsohn, Jr., Knoxville, Tennessee
Mr. R. A. Hummel, New York, New York
Mr. Clarence Budington Kelland, Scottsdale, Arizona
Hon. James S. Kemper, Chicago, Illinois
Hon. J. Bracken Lee, Salt Lake City, Utah
Mr. William Loeb, Reno, Nevada
Mr. R. Chesley McCormick, Wichita, Kansas
Mr. William L. McGrath, Cincinnati, Ohio
Mr. Sterling Morton, Chicago, Illinois
Mrs. Ruth Murray, Oshkosh, Wisconsin
Hon. Gerald P. Nye, Cooperstown, North Dakota
Hon. Samuel B. Pettengill, Grafton, Vermont
Mr. J. Howard Pew, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
Chief Justice M. T. Phelps, Phoenix, Arizona
Mr. Henning W. Prentiss, Jr., Lancaster, Pennsylvania
Col. Willard F. Rockwell, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania
Mr. Hubbard S. Russell, Maricopa, California
Lieut. General George E. Stratemeyer, Winter Park, Florida
Mr. Ernest G. Swigert, Portland, Oregon
Mrs. Garvin E. Tankersley, Bethesda, Maryland
Dr. Charles C. Tansill, Washington, D. C.
Mr. E. McL. Tittmann, New York, New York
General Albert Wedemeyer, Boyds, Maryland
Hon. Burton K. Wheeler, Butte, Montana
General Robert E. Wood, Chicago, Illinois
Dean Clarence Manion—Legal Counsel, South Bend, Indiana
Brig. Gen. Bonner Fellers—Study Coordinator, Washington, D.C.

Members of this committee are not isolationists.
They believe in the principle that commercial inter-
course is of great importance to stabilize the world.
They support the expansion of international trade by
route of the free enterprise system.

Date Received

8/31/59

From

Chicago

(Name of contributor)

(Address of contributor)

By

(Name of Special Agent)

To Be Returned

Yes ()

No (✓)

Description: Booklet entitled

"The Searchers"

File No.

100-32899-1a(6)

THE SCOREBOARD

Basic Communist strategy for conquest of the world, as laid out thirty-five years ago and relentlessly followed ever since, consisted of three steps: (1) Take eastern Europe; (2) next take the masses of Asia; (3) then take the rest of the world, including the United States. The Communists completed their first step in 1950; the second step is now at least three-fourths accomplished; and they have gone more than one-fourth of the way towards carrying out their third step. Which means that the Communists have now covered well over two-thirds of the total distance to their final goal of world-wide dominion. And the momentum and the speed of their progress are steadily increasing.

BETWEEN 1937 AND 1957 the expansion of Communist power in the world was approximately eight hundred percent — whether you measured that growth in the number of Party members, in the number of enslaved subjects, or by whatever unit of comparison. But during the past two years the rate of expansion has markedly increased.

For a decade after World War II the Communists *averaged* adding to their empire seven thousand newly enslaved subjects every hour, twenty-four hours of every day, 365 days of every year. But by 1958 that rate of conquest had come up to about twelve thousand new slaves per hour. And the once free peoples of Indonesia, Iraq, Morocco, Tunisia, Bolivia, Venezuela, Cuba, Ghana, Guinea, and other nations now slipping into Communist police-state rule, would gladly bear witness to both the truth and the horror of this record. How free the status of their former "colonialism" would seem to many of them today!

But the most ominous part of the Communist advance is also the most

difficult to appraise. That is the rise of Communist influence in countries which are still considered to be clearly in, and on the side of, the remaining "free world." That there are ways of estimating how far the insidious tide has risen, however, even in these areas where much firm dry land still remains, has been decisively demonstrated by our experience in putting together the scores in this tabulation.

For several different scholars on four different continents, each of them a serious long-time student of the methods, purposes and progress of the Communist conspiracy, compiled his scoreboard independently of all the others. Each one made his own estimates as objectively and conscientiously as he knew how. And the resulting figures from these different experts, for all but one or two of the 105 countries listed, were so close as to be startling — and convincing. Believing therefore that our composite appraisals are dependable, significant, revealing — and frightening — we present *The American Opinion Scoreboard for 1959*.

This article is reprinted from *American Opinion*, an informal review published eleven times per year. Annual subscription, five dollars. Or send one dollar for two consecutive issues to find out whether you like us.

Address: AMERICAN OPINION, Belmont 78, Massachusetts

The American Opinion Scoreboard

In the following tabulation we have undertaken to estimate the present degree of Communist influence or control over the economic and political affairs of almost all of the "nations" of the world. (The omissions have been due to lack of size, importance, or autonomy.) The chief source of such control or influence may be Communist-run labor unions (as in Bolivia), or Communist sympathizers in government (as in India), or powerful Communist political parties (as in Italy), or highly successful Communist agitation and propaganda (as in Mexico). The total extent of Communist control or influence over any country, however, is due to the impact of all Communist pressures, direct and indirect, visible and undercover, working together. In most cases, of course, that total cannot be measured with exactness. But

we believe the estimates given below to be conservative, as of June 1, 1959.

It is only when this scoreboard is compared with any similar one, which might have been compiled as recently as 1952, that its significance becomes so shockingly apparent. Each change since the 1958 Scoreboard — if sufficient to change the whole bracket shown against any country — is indicated by a star, and itemized on the last page of this insert.

The Kremlin's biggest concern now is to keep the remainder of the free world, and especially the people of the United States, from realizing the speed and certainty with which the Communists are completing their conquest of the planet. We intend to publish a revised scoreboard once a year until the conspiracy is entirely successful or has been entirely destroyed.

COMMUNIST INFLUENCE

As A Percentage Of Total Control

1. Aden	20 to 40%	19. Chile	40 to 60%
2. Afghanistan	80 - 100	20. Communist China	100
3. Albania	100	21. Nationalist China	0 - 20
4. Argentina	40 - 60	22. Colombia	20 - 40
5. Australia	0 - 20	23. Costa Rica	20 - 40
6. Austria	20 - 40	24. Cuba	70 - 90★
7. Belgian Congo	20 - 40★	25. Czechoslovakia	100
8. Belgium	20 - 40	26. Denmark	20 - 40
9. Bolivia	70 - 90★	27. Dominican Republic	0 - 20
10. Brazil	40 - 60	28. East Germany	100
11. Britain	40 - 60★	29. Ecuador	20 - 40★
12. British Guiana	80 - 100	30. Egypt	80 - 100
13. Bulgaria	100	31. El Salvador	20 - 40
14. Burma	60 - 80	32. Ethiopia	60 - 80
15. Cambodia	80 - 100	33. Finland	60 - 80
16. Canada	40 - 60★	34. France	30 - 50★
17. Central African Federation	20 - 40★	35. French Equatorial Africa	20 - 40
18. Ceylon	60 - 80	36. French Togoland	40 - 60

The Scoreboard

37. Ghana	80 to 100%	72. Outer Mongolia	100%
38. Greece	40 - 60	73. Pakistan	30 - 50★
39. Guatemala	60 - 80	74. Panama	60 - 80
40. Guinea	80 - 100★	75. Paraguay	20 - 40★
41. Haiti	20 - 40	76. Peru	20 - 40
42. Honduras	40 - 60	77. Philippines	20 - 40
43. Hungary	100	78. Poland	100
44. Iceland	80 - 100	79. Portugal	0 - 20
45. India	60 - 80	80. Romania	100
46. Indonesia	80 - 100	81. Saudi Arabia	60 - 80
47. Iran	20 - 40	82. Sierra Leone	30 - 50★
48. Iraq	80 - 100★	83. Singapore	70 - 90★
49. Ireland	0 - 20	84. Somalia	40 - 60
50. Israel	40 - 60	85. South Korea	10 - 30★
51. Italy	40 - 60	86. South Vietnam	40 - 60
52. Japan	20 - 40	87. Soviet Union	100
53. Jordan	20 - 40	88. Spain	0 - 20
54. Kenya	20 - 40	89. Sudan	50 - 70★
55. Laos	80 - 100	90. Sweden	20 - 40
56. Lebanon	60 - 80★	91. Switzerland	20 - 40
57. Liberia	30 - 50★	92. Syria	80 - 100
58. Libya	60 - 80	93. Tanganyika	20 - 40
59. Luxembourg	20 - 40	94. Thailand	40 - 60
60. Madagascar	20 - 40	95. Tibet	80 - 100
61. Malaya	40 - 60	96. Tunisia	80 - 100
62. Mexico	40 - 60	97. Turkey	0 - 20
63. Morocco	60 - 80	98. Uganda	20 - 40
64. Nepal	60 - 80	99. Union of South Africa	0 - 20
65. Netherlands	20 - 40★	100. United States	30 - 50★
66. New Zealand	0 - 20	101. Uruguay	40 - 60
67. Nicaragua	20 - 40	102. Venezuela	80 - 100★
68. Nigeria	30 - 50★	103. West Germany	0 - 20
69. North Korea	100	104. Yemen	80 - 100
70. North Vietnam	100	105. Yugoslavia	100
71. Norway	50 - 70★		

Footnotes On Changes

Obviously there have been changes in the degree of Communist influence in practically every country. But the changes shown, and discussed below, are only those which moved our estimate into a whole new bracket from the one given last year.

7. Belgian Congo. 1918: 0-20%. 1919: 20-40%. This change reflects the long reach of the

agitation against "colonialism," sparked by Kwame Nkrumah.

9. Bolivia. 1918: 40-60%. 1919: 70-90%. The Communists have steadily tightened their grip. They now own Bolivia, to whatever extent they wish to show their hand.

11. Britain. 1918: 20-40%. 1919: 40-60%. Thanks to the "let's surrender" crusade of Ber-

Footnotes On Changes

trand Russell, the pusillanimous appeasement policies of Harold Macmillan, and other factors, the Communist influence in and over Britain has markedly increased during the past twelve months.

16. Canada, 1918: 20-40%, 1919: 40-60%. The erosion of resistance to Communist men and measures is subtle, gradual—and deadly.

17. Central African Federation, 1918: 0-20%, 1919: 20-40%. This is simply due to the Communist forces now increasingly at work all over Africa.

24. Cuba, 1918: 40-60%, 1919: 70-90%. Last year the potential Communist take-over of Cuba was merely casting its shadow before it. This year it is an accomplished fact.

29. Ecuador, 1918: 0-20%, 1919: 20-40%. It is no secret that the situation in most of Latin America has rapidly grown worse since June 1, 1918.

34. France, 1918: 40-60%, 1919: 30-50%. This is the one improvement noted on the whole planet. In our opinion much credit must go to de Gaulle and even more to Jacques Soustelle.

40. Guinea, 1918: (As part of French West Africa), 40-60%, 1919: 80-100%. Sekou Touré has now made the break with France complete; the break with civilization, and absorption of his country into the Soviet barbarism, all but complete.

48. Iraq, 1918: 20-40%, 1919: 80-100%. This "swing" is drastic, but so were the developments. Our estimate last year was undoubtedly too conservative. The violent seizure of Iraq by the Communists was more sudden and complete than anything we had anticipated.

56. Lebanon, 1918: 40-60%, 1919: 60-80%. Lebanon was just one more victim of a "Murphy good-will mission" — as well as of other forces. Under the guise of protecting and helping Lebanon, our government made Rashid Karami, the leading Communist of that small country (and the man most approved by Nassar), its Prime Minister, Minister of Finance, Minister of National Economy, Minister of Defense, and Minister of Information. With just one more blow of our helping hand the Communist control of Lebanon could move into the highest bracket.

57. Liberia, 1918: 20-40%, 1919: 30-50%. The change is merely another indication of the rising tide in Africa.

61. Netherlands, 1918: 0-20%, 1919: 20-40%. Whether or not our estimate in 1918 was too low, we don't know. We are sure this one is not too high.

68. Nigeria, 1918: 20-40%, 1919: 30-50%. Just another case of crumbling before the African "wave."

71. Norway, 1918: 40-60%, 1919: 50-70%. The change is partly the recognition and result of a continuing process; but it is partly just to make our estimate of Norway more realistic than that of last year.

73. Pakistan, 1918: 20-40%, 1919: 30-50%. Sad, unfortunate, not translatable into specifics—but true.

74. Paraguay, 1918: 0-20%, 1919: 20-40%. General Alfredo Stroessner, President of Paraguay, is one of the few firm anti-Communists still remaining as heads of Latin American governments. But of late months he has had to give considerable ground to "liberal" pressures.

82. Sierra Leone, 1918: 20-40%, 1919: 30-50%. More washing from the African wave.

83. Singapore, 1918: 60-80%, 1919: 70-90%. The last elections show that Singapore is already "beyond the point of no return."

81. South Korea, 1918: 0-20%, 1919: 10-30%. The tremendous Communist efforts have gained footholds that cannot be ignored.

89. Sudan, 1918: 20-40%, 1919: 50-70%. This heavy gain in the strength of the Communists is largely due to the help and encouragement given them by that sterling non-Communist (1), G. A. Nasser.

100. The United States, 1918: 20-40%, 1919: 30-50%. We were worried about defending our own conviction that Communist influence, over everything of political or economic importance done in or by the United States, now amounts to more than thirty percent of total control. Then we got the surprise of our lives in the far higher estimates from some of our experts.

We have kept this bracket, with fifty percent as the top limit to our appraisal, nevertheless. We are aware that the actual number of Communists and Communist sympathizers within our borders has little bearing on the case. For the Communists have taken over some countries completely with as little as one percent of the population as active agents. We agree with our experts that the Communist influence inside our government itself today is overwhelming. We know that this influence is almost as extreme within our educational, religious, and labor organizations. But we feel that there are still tremendous layers of Americanist strength not yet rotted by all of the infiltration, indoctrination, and political sabotage to which we have been subjected.

Here is a *fact*, however, which good Americans should note with alarm and anxiety. These men are the best informed authorities we know. Several of them, in or from Europe, Asia or Australia, are able to look at our situation more objectively than we can. They agree closely with us, and with each other, concerning every other country. And these men believe that the degree of Communist influence in the United States today amounts to *between 50% and 70% of total control*.

102. Venezuela, 1918: 20-40%, 1919: 80-100%. As in the case of Iraq, our 1918 figure was too low. And perhaps in the case of Venezuela we should have been more aware of the nearness and force of the coming storm.

Date Received

8/31/59

From

Chicago

(Name of contributor)

(Address of contributor)

By

(Name of Special Agent)

To Be Returned

Yes ()
No (X)

Description:

Letter dated 6/29/59
on letterhead of "American

File No.

100-32899-1a(7)

Opinion" to

b6
b7C

AMERICAN OPINION

An Informal Review

Belmont 78. Massachusetts

June 29, 1959

(Dictated June 26)

[Redacted]

b6
b7C

Dear [Redacted]

Many thanks for your letter of June 22.

A subscription to AMERICAN OPINION has been entered for you, to begin with the June number, which is going forward under separate cover today. The July-August will be mailed when it comes from the press in another two or three days. And as you will see from a subscription blank in either magazine, the rate is \$5.00 per year, in case you like it well enough to subscribe.

In another few days we shall be sending you an unpublished manuscript of mine which is quite confidential, and which I believe you will find of considerable interest. It is not out of the category of "simply more reading matter," which you mention; but we shall be taking you up on the possibility of "doing things for us" within another few weeks. As my good friend, [Redacted] may indicate to you, we have a movement under way of which you undoubtedly have heard nothing -- because we are concentrating entirely on building strength and understanding, rather than creating noise -- of which he has been an enthusiastic supporter since it started last December, and which already has local working chapters in four states. Since it really takes two full days to present properly the background, methods, and purposes of THE JOHN RIRCH SOCIETY, I should not attempt any explanation in a letter. But we shall see that you learn all about it as soon as is practicable, and as soon as there is any chance of our following up whatever interest you may have.

b6
b7C

In the meantime, if it fits into your scheme of things to get us any signatures on the petitions of the COMMITTEE AGAINST SUMMIT ENTANGLEMENTS, or to mail out these blank petitions to other conservative friends who might do so, this immediate and temporary help to one of our many efforts would be much appreciated.

With thanks again for your kind and encouraging letter, I am

Sincerely,

Robert Welch

Robert Welch

RW:ccb

COMMITTEE AGAINST SUMMIT ENTANGLEMENTS

385 CONCORD AVENUE
BELMONT 78, MASSACHUSETTS

Chairman

Robert Welch

Vice Chairmen

Spruille Braden
Alfred Kohlberg
Clarence Manion

Executive Committee

Thomas J. Anderson
Robert B. Dresser
Barry Goldwater
E. P. Hamilton
A. G. Hainholz, Jr.
Gale G. Parker
Samuel B. Pettengill
J. Nelson Shepherd
Robert W. Stoddard
Elizabeth W. Wilson

National Board

T. Coleman Andrews
George W. Armstrong, Jr.
John U. Barr
Laurence E. Bunker
H. G. Carpenter
E. Gino Chance
Kenneth W. Colegrove
Martin J. Condon, III
W. J. Bryan Dorn
Pierre S. du Pont, 3rd
Franklin Farfel, Jr.
Dorothy B. Frankston
J. H. Gipsen, Sr.
Wm. J. Grede
A. Brooks Harlow
B. E. Hutchinson
Husband E. Kimmel
Fred C. Koch
Rue Wilder Lane
J. Bracken Lee
F. F. Looock
Ross Martin
Frank E. Masland, Jr.
N. Floyd McGowin
W. L. McGrath
Ludwig von Mises
Reville B. Oliver
J. Howard Pew
Henry Pope, Jr.
Paulus P. Powell
Louis Ruthenburg
Gordon H. Scherer
T. G. W. Settle
Wint. Smith
Robert B. Snowden
Suzanne Silvercrus Stevenson
George H. Williamson

June 17, 1959

Dear Fellow American:

The first formal mailing by this committee was sent out on May 28. The response, immediate, enthusiastic, and widespread, is now beginning to gather real momentum.

As stated in our first letter, we are appealing to every man and woman who believes in the inevitably disastrous results, for our country and for the remaining free world, of "summit" concessions and entanglements.

The fifty thousand petitions we have mailed out to date should serve only as seed corn. With the help of every patriot we can reach directly, in sowing these petitions far and wide, we can harvest such a crop of signatures as it will be impossible to ignore. And we can present a powerful front of opposition to a repetition of the 1955 summit performance of fraternization and appeasement.

Now is the time to make your own opposition visible and effective. Put these petitions into the hands of as many others as you can, and urge everybody to get them filled out with signatures and mailed back to us as promptly as possible. We'll see that they reach Washington in a dignified and respectful manner, but with dramatic impact.

Sincerely,

Robert Welch

Please Mr. President. Don't Go

1.

2.

3.

4.

5.

6.

7.

8.

9.

10.

11.

12.

13.

14.

15.

16.

17.

18.

19.

20.

b6
b7C

These pocket petitions are issued by the

Committee Against Summit Entanglements

The Committee respectfully petitions the President of the United States not to attend a "summit conference" with the tyrants of the Kremlin, for the following reasons.

1. It will further increase Soviet prestige.
2. It will further discourage anti-Communists everywhere and weaken their will to resist.
3. It will play right into the hands of all of the appeasement-minded politicians, and weaken the position of the firm anti-Communist statesmen, in all the governmental circles of the remaining free world.
4. The results of the last "summit conference" have proved to be huge gains for the Soviets, and huge losses for the anti-Communist forces. We should be guided by this experience.
5. Experience has further and fully demonstrated that any agreements which the Soviets do make will be ignored or broken, as soon as it suits their convenience.
6. The only questions raised or discussed will be as to *how far* we will give in to Soviet demands. Under such conditions we have all to lose and nothing to gain.
7. The President of the United States is seriously handicapped, in bargaining in any such conference with a man like Khrushchev. The President's commitments are not final, but must later be ratified by the Senate, as is well known to the Soviet Premier, who can himself speak with dictatorial authority.
8. It is an unconstitutional way for an American President to conduct foreign affairs. Treaties must be entered into with the *advice and consent* of the Senate. Even if retroactive consent is later obtained, both Senate and Executive are violating the Constitution as to the *advice* of the Senate during the negotiations.
9. Syngman Rhee is correct that "what is morally wrong can never be politically right." It is morally wrong to fraternize with murderers.
10. And Jacques Soustelle is correct that, when dealing with the Soviets, always or on any issue, "to negotiate is to surrender."

These petitions will be mailed, postage prepaid at

20 for \$1.00 100 for \$3.00 1000 for \$20.00

For more petitions order from, and when each petition
is completed mail to

MR. ROBERT WELCH, *Chairman*

BELMONT 78, MASSACHUSETTS

July 2, 1959

Dear Mr. Welch,

You aroused my curiosity tremendously in your letter of June 29th but whatever [redacted] stands for, I stand for and whatever I can do that does not distract too much from my number one heavy responsibility of [redacted] [redacted] with more problems to the square inch than you could try to figure out, if you started from scratch.

Am hoping to hear from him soon and am also looking forward to your confidential manuscript which I assure you I will not think of in terms of "simply more reading matter". Will either send you some names or contact your Committee Against Summit Entanglements or contact them directly.

b6
b7c

Hoping indeed to get my teeth into a real constructive project.

Sincerely,

[redacted]

HSK/gf

Document 2000
SOUTHWESTERN

July 2, 1959

Dear [REDACTED]

Have had a fascinating letter from Robert Welch indicating that you are the instigator of a "new movement" which is very hush-hush. Apparently Mr. Welch is considering allowing me to get on the bandwagon. If you're in charge of whatever it is that he's speaking about, then I could only be for it.

There are some of the Directors on the American Opinion roster that I'm not so keen about, but so what! You're my guarantee on anything and whatever I can do to follow through on the basic concepts, as I see it to protect this our United States from infiltration and from stupidity of not recognizing what is front of our eyes, I'm for it and eager to hear from you. Until I do I suppose I will remain "in the dark".

b6
b7C

Sincerely,

[REDACTED]
HSK/gf

July 7, 1959

Mr. Robert Welch
Belmont 78, Massachusetts

Dear Mr. Welch:

I have received your confidential document, have not broken the seal and have put it in the vault because I want you to know that [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] and [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] and I are carrying on with a considerable project here.

Just so that this does not make a difference, I decided I'd better put it in the vault and see if you still wanted me to open it. If not, I will return it to you with no hard feelings whatsoever.

However, I would appreciate if you would check with [REDACTED] who is an old friend of mine, as I would like to be on the inside of this project. I have received a letter from him today which I have not yet had time to read.

I can assure you that I can be trusted to keep a thing marked confidential confidential without any equivocation about it, and I would be very much honored to be allowed to be part of your inner circle, so to speak. But as you indicate that I am one of the few people you do not know personally to whom you are sending this manuscript. I would much prefer that you would check on me with [REDACTED] who happens to be the only person that I know well on your list of Board Members, etc.

I am neighbor to and very close friend of [REDACTED], who is also a close friend of [REDACTED] and a considerably important person in the United States Chamber of Commerce. I await your answer.

Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

HSK:s

Date Received

8/31/59

From

Chicago

(Name of contributor)

(Address of contributor)

By

(Name of Special Agent)

To Be Returned

Yes ()

No (X)

Description:

Letter to
dated 7/16/59



File No.

100-32899-1a(8)

b6
b7c

AMERICAN OPINION

An Informal Review

Belmont 78, Massachusetts

July 16, 1959
(Dictated July 15, 1959)

Dear [REDACTED]

It will be entirely all right for you to let [REDACTED] read the confidential manuscript which was sent to you, provided he does not then pass it on to anybody else, and you do not let anybody else have it without first checking with us. Or, you might prefer, as we do, for us to send a copy to [REDACTED] himself, so that he may read it more at leisure, and not feel hurried to put the manuscript back in to your hands. In that case, will you please let us know, and we'll send him a copy of this manuscript, THE POLITICIAN, at once, with a covering letter stating that this is done at your request. If not, and you handle as suggested in your letter, will you please give us [REDACTED] address anyway, so that we shall have it in our records of those who have read this document.

b6
b7C

The manuscript will not really give you any information concerning THE JOHN BIRCH SOCIETY, concerning which [REDACTED] has written you for me, but will at least give both you and [REDACTED] a better understanding of how serious is the danger we face, and how far advanced the conspiracy threatening us, as we see it. And you will then find that THE JOHN BIRCH SOCIETY is a movement, started quietly by this writer with a small group of leading industrialists who met with me in Indianapolis last December, for the purpose of building strength and understanding to combat this conspiracy -- while avoiding publicity to the fullest extent possible, because creating noise is no part of our intention. The movement is growing very rapidly, with extremely encouraging support from a great many patriotic leaders; and while we do not believe we shall be in position to form regular chapters in Indiana for a few months yet, we shall welcome both yourself and [REDACTED] as members of our Home Chapter -- with whom we maintain contact entirely by mail -- if and when you become convinced that our work is worthy of your serious interest and strong support.

With much appreciation of the meticulous sense of integrity which you have maintained in connection with this whole matter, and with all good wishes, I am

Sincerely,

Robert Welch

Robert Welch

EW:mlp

COMMITTEE AGAINST SUMMIT ENTANGLEMENTS

385 CONCORD AVENUE
BELMONT 78, MASSACHUSETTS

Chairman

Robert Welch

Vice Chairmen

Spruille Braden
Alfred Kohlberg
Clarence Manion

Executive Committee

Thomas J. Anderson
Robert B. Dresser
Betsy Goldwater
E. P. Hamilton
A. G. Heinsch, Jr.
Cola G. Parker
Samuel B. Pettengill
J. Nelson Shepherd
Robert W. Stoddard
Elizabeth W. Wilson

National Board

T. Coleman Andrews
George W. Armstrong, Jr.
John L. Barr
Laurence E. Bunker
H. G. Carpenter
F. Gano Chance
Kenneth W. Colegrove
Marion J. Condon, III
W. J. Bryan Dora
Pierre S. du Pont, 3rd
Franklin Farrel, Jr.
Dorothy B. Frankston
J. H. Gipson, Sr.
Wm. J. Grede
A. Brooks Harlow
B. E. Hutchinson
Hubbard E. Kimmel
Fred C. Koch
Rose Wilder Lane
J. Bracken Lee
F. P. Lusk
Ross Martin
Frank E. Mayland, Jr.
N. Floyd McGowan
W. L. McGrath
Ludwig von Mises
Revilo P. Oliver
J. Howard Pew
Henry Pope, Jr.
Paulus P. Powell
Louis Ruthenburg
Gordon H. Scherer
T. G. W. Settle
Wm. Smith
Robert B. Snowden
Suzanne Silvercray Stevens
George H. Williamson

June 17, 1959

Dear Fellow American:

The first formal mailing by this committee was sent out on May 28. The response, immediate, enthusiastic, and widespread, is now beginning to gather real momentum.

As stated in our first letter, we are appealing to every man and woman who believes in the inevitably disastrous results, for our country and for the remaining free world, of "summit" concessions and entanglements.

The fifty thousand petitions we have mailed out to date should serve only as seed corn. With the help of every patriot we can reach directly, in sowing these petitions far and wide, we can harvest such a crop of signatures as it will be impossible to ignore. And we can present a powerful front of opposition to a repetition of the 1955 summit performance of fraternization and appeasement.

Now is the time to make your own opposition visible and effective. Put these petitions into the hands of as many others as you can, and urge everybody to get them filled out with signatures and mailed back to us as promptly as possible. We'll see that they reach Washington in a dignified and respectful manner, but with dramatic impact.

Sincerely,

Robert Welch

Date Received 8/31/59

From Chicago
(Name of contributor)

(Address of contributor)

By _____
(Name of Special Agent)

To Be Returned Yes ()
No (X)

Description: Letter dated 7/2/59
from Robert Welch to

File No. 100-32899-1A(9)

b6
b7c

AMERICAN OPINION

An Informal Review

Belmont 78, Massachusetts

July 2, 1959



b6
b7c

Dear 

Under separate cover today, I am sending you by registered first-class mail, return receipt requested, copy of an extremely confidential document.

This manuscript is not intended for publication at all. But I am putting it into the hands of a limited number of good friends and outstanding patriots, who can be depended on to treat it with the confidence requested, and to take reasonable precautions to safeguard the document while it is in their possession. And I do believe that it will give even so well informed a man as yourself a certain amount of additional insight into some aspects of the conspiracy which we face.

With all good wishes, I am

Sincerely,

Robert Welch

RW:mlp

P. S. You are one of the few men I do not really know personally to whom I am sending this manuscript. But I know enough about your patriotic outlook and purposes from your correspondence to feel that it is entirely safe to do so. RW

These pocket petitions are issued by the

Committee Against Summit Entanglements

The Committee respectfully petitions the President of the United States not to attend a "summit conference" with the tyrants of the Kremlin, for the following reasons.

1. It will further increase Soviet prestige.
2. It will further discourage anti-Communists everywhere and weaken their will to resist.
3. It will play right into the hands of all of the appeasement-minded politicians, and weaken the position of the firm anti-Communist statesmen, in all the governmental circles of the remaining free world.
4. The results of the last "summit conference" have proved to be huge gains for the Soviets, and huge losses for the anti-Communist forces. We should be guided by this experience.
5. Experience has further and fully demonstrated that any agreements which the Soviets do make will be ignored or broken, as soon as it suits their convenience.
6. The only questions raised or discussed will be as to *how far* we will give in to Soviet demands. Under such conditions we have all to lose and nothing to gain.
7. The President of the United States is seriously handicapped, in bargaining in any such conference with a man like Khrushchev. The President's commitments are not final, but must later be ratified by the Senate, as is well known to the Soviet Premier, who can himself speak with dictatorial authority.
8. It is an unconstitutional way for an American President to conduct foreign affairs. Treaties must be entered into with the *advice and consent* of the Senate. Even if retroactive consent is later obtained, both Senate and Executive are violating the Constitution as to the *advice* of the Senate during the negotiations.
9. Syngman Rhee is correct that "what is morally wrong can never be politically right." It is morally wrong to fraternize with murderers.
10. And Jacques Soustelle is correct that, when dealing with the Soviets, always or on any issue, "to negotiate is to surrender."

These petitions will be mailed, postage prepaid at
20 for \$1.00 100 for \$3.00 1000 for \$20.00

For more petitions order from, and when each petition
is completed mail to

MR. ROBERT WELCH, *Chairman*

BELMONT 78, MASSACHUSETTS

Please, Mr. President, Don't Go

Name

Address

1.

2.

3.

4.

5.

6.

7.

8.

9.

10.

11.

12.

13.

14.

15.

16.

17.

18.

19.

20.

COMMITTEE AGAINST SUMMIT ENTANGLEMENTS

385 CONCORD AVENUE
BELMONT 78, MASSACHUSETTS

Chairman

Robert Welch

Vice Chairmen

Spruille Braden
Alfred Kohlberg
Clarence Manion

Executive Committee

Thomas J. Anderson
Robert B. Dresser
Barry Goldwater
E. D. Hamilton
A. G. Hainsworth, Jr.
Colt G. Parker
Samuel B. Pettengill
J. Nelson Shepherd
Robert W. Stoddard
Elizabeth W. Wilson

National Board

T. Coleman Andrews
George W. Armstrong, Jr.
John U. Barr
Laurence E. Bunker
H. G. Carpenter
F. Gino Chance
Kenneth W. Colegrove
Martin J. Condon, III
W. J. Bryan Dorn
Pierre S. du Pont, 3rd
Franklin Farrel, Jr.
Dorothy B. Frankston
J. H. Gibson, Sr.
Wm. J. Grede
A. Brooks Hiclow
B. F. Hutchinson
Husband E. Kimmel
Fred C. Koch
Ross Wilder Lane
J. Bracken Lee
F. F. Look
Ross Martin
Frank E. Masland, Jr.
N. Floyd McGowin
W. L. McGrath
Ludwig von Mises
Rexford P. Oliver
J. Howard Pew
Henry Pope, Jr.
Paulus P. Powell
Louis Ruthenburg
Gordon H. Scherer
T. G. W. Sattle
Wm. Smith
Robert B. Snowden
Suzanne Silvercray Stevenson
George H. Williamson

June 29, 1959

To An Editor, Or Other Patriotic Leader:

We have forwarded the enclosed petitions, with signatures, to the White House, in one mailing per week, on the following schedule:

<u>Week Beginning</u>	<u>Number Of Signed Petitions</u>
May 11	1
May 18	2
May 25	4
June 1	8
June 8	16
June 15	32
June 22	64
June 29	128

While not all of these petitions have been completely filled with the twenty signatures, most of them have been, and they have averaged at least fifteen signatures per petition. The count and the actual mailing in each case have been certified by three witnesses. This procedure will be continued.

We already have enough signed petitions to take care of the 256 we shall need next week and the 512 we shall need during the week beginning July 13. But the stream of petitions now pouring in on us must increase to a veritable flood, to keep up for long with a need expanding at such a rate.

Assuring you, therefore, of our appreciation for any help you have already given us, with publicity or otherwise, and of continued appreciation for further support, we are hopefully calling the obvious truth to your attention: How long we can maintain this mailing schedule and its dramatic impact depends primarily on people like yourself.

Sincerely,

Robert Welch

P.S. Of course we shall be glad to send blank petitions promptly to anybody who requests them. RW

Date Received 8/31/59

From Chicago
(Name of contributor)

(Address of contributor)

By _____
(Name of Special Agent)

To Be Returned Yes ()
No (☒)

Description:

John Birch
Society Bulletin for July
100-32899-12(10)

File No. _____

THE JOHN BIRCH SOCIETY
Belmont 78, Massachusetts

Bulletin For July
June 30, 1959
Copyright 1959 by the Society

Foreword

Let us not be afraid to express the truth, merely because some liberal may call it trite.

Each effort of each of us as individuals is only a grain of sand. Yet a whole mighty barricade is built with grains of sand.

The millions of patriotic anti-Communists in America today are putting forth enough effort to hold back the Communist flood. But they are dropping the particles of their opposition in too many different places at too many different times. So that these grains of sand are scattered and made useless by the winds of the oncoming storm.

One of the major objectives of our Society, and the specific purpose of these bulletins, is to coordinate our efforts, so that we all add our grains of sand to the same piles at the same time. Only in this way can we build these piles together, in time, into a wall that the flood cannot break down or overcome.

To Home Chapter Members

In the seating of the representatives of the "government" of East Germany on an exact par with those of West Germany, the Communists got everything they expected out of the Four Ministers Conference in Geneva on the very first day. Everything, that is, except the announcement of a Summit Conference. And that, apparently, had to wait until the American Congress had adjourned. So, finding the stalling motions increasingly awkward and obvious, the Four Ministers recessed their meeting until July 13. But the chances are very strong that the date and place of a Summit Conference have already been determined; and that the "progress" at Geneva will justify the announcement soon after Congress goes home.

However -- if we can maintain a rising crescendo of opposition during the time that is available, it is even possible that we may be able to bring about a "postponement" of this Summit Conference. Even if not

we can certainly help to keep it from being so disastrous a sell-out of the West as the Communists -- in both Moscow and Washington -- have intended. In the printed "letter to an editor" enclosed with this bulletin is shown the ascending scale of the weekly mailing of petitions by the COMMITTEE AGAINST SUMMIT ENTANGLEMENTS. To maintain the dramatic impact of this schedule the Committee will need to receive a veritable and increasing flood of petitions with signatures.

While we expect each member of our Home Chapter to read all of this bulletin, therefore, in order to be posted on everything we are doing; and while we hope you will take part in any and all of our other activities that you can; nevertheless we think that the most important thing you might do right now, to support the purposes to which our Society is dedicated, is to spread these CASE petitions, and get them filled with signatures and returned to us as promptly as possible.

To All Chapter Leaders

Beginning with this issue, we are mailing copies of these monthly bulletins directly to all members of the Society. Because of the cost involved, we shall still send all materials to which the bulletins refer, in bulk, to you, for distribution at your next chapter meeting. This meeting should still take place regularly at as early a date in the month as can be arranged. And we believe that putting the bulletins in the hands of the individual members in advance, so that the members can be better informed, will actually help to make your discussions more fruitful and your whole meeting more effective. This step is not intended to relieve any Chapter Leader, in the slightest degree, of his responsibility for seeing that our requests are understood and carried out, so far as is at all practicable, by every member of his chapter.

Nor do these direct mailings relieve any member of a local chapter of his (or her) duty to attend the regular monthly meeting or such special meetings as the Chapter Leader may need to call. These get-togethers are absolutely vital to the proper functioning of our Society. In fact, we intend periodically to drop from membership in the Society those who -- without the excuse of serious illness or an equally valid reason -- are not faithful and regular in attendance. Nobody has to belong to The John Birch Society. But those who do belong must live up to the promise of dedication and effort which membership implies. We, at least, are not merely going through motions, and we mean business every step of the way.

While we shall henceforth address our requests in these bulletins, therefore, directly to our members, it is up to each Chapter Leader to exercise exactly the same leadership, in connection with all of them, and in every other way, as before. With that thoroughly understood, and after this necessary explanation, we can proceed to the agenda for July.

To All Local Chapter Members

1. Everything we have said above (in the paragraphs for Home Chapter members) concerning the CASE petitions, applies to the members of our working chapters as well. Please read the "letter to an editor" which is enclosed. July is probably the month that will really tell the story, on whether there will be a Summit Conference in the near future, and on how much we can modify the disaster if there is one. Here is a pile of our effort to which you should add every grain of sand that you can.

2. Please obtain from your Chapter Leader (at the regular monthly meeting) a copy of the Citizens Foreign Aid Committee booklet. A sufficient number for that purpose has been mailed to him (or her). This is an excellent presentation of the case against foreign aid and should be read by every one of our members.

Your Chapter Leader will also give each member three copies of the thin four-page folder headed "Just a minute, Mr. Congressman" As you will see, on Page 3 of these folders, they are really petitions, intended for mailing by any good citizen to his Congressman and to each of his two Senators. The right "to petition the government for a redress of grievances" is guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States. The whole present foreign-aid program is certainly a grievance, of a most serious nature, to every patriotic American. We expect each of our members to do his duty.

3. A number of our members work in libraries. Being conservatives, they are keenly aware of the tremendous advantage given by most libraries today to books promoting the so-called "liberal" line. But they are unanimous in agreement that, with rare exceptions, any library will simply have to buy, and keep available for its readers, any book -- even of the most conservative or anti-Communist variety -- for which there is any emphatic and continuing demand at the desk. As one assignment for July, therefore, we are asking our members to check public libraries and branches in their respective areas with regard to the five books named below. Help to create the demand that will cause the library to keep all

five in stock and available for the public. This assistance will be especially welcomed by our librarian members. The books are:

Draskovich: TITO, MOSCOW'S TROJAN HORSE (Regnery)
Victor J. Fox: THE PENTAGON CASE (Available from The Bookmailer)
Rosalie M. Gordon: NINE MEN AGAINST AMERICA (Devin-Adair)
Hayek: THE ROAD TO SERFDOM (Univ. of Chicago Press)
Jordan: FROM MAJOR JORDAN'S DIARIES (The Bookmailer)

Not one of these books is out of print. (Major Jordan's Diaries was out of print, but a new two-dollar edition has been brought out by The Bookmailer.) So that reason for not having any of these books on the library shelves will not suffice. And we shall make similar requests concerning other books, in later months.

4. Mr. Avery Brundage, in his biographical sketch in the latest Who's Who In America, describes himself as an amateur sportsman. He modestly admits that he was "amateur all-around champion of America" (whatever that may mean) in the years 1914, 1916, 1918. He mentions that he has written "various articles on amateur sport" (but naturally says nothing about having contributed an article in November, 1956 to World Youth, the official publication of the Communist-controlled World Federation of Democratic Youth). And he records that he was president for seven terms of the Amateur Athletic Union of the United States. As Gilbert and Sullivan might have put it, "he's the very model" of our amateur sportsman.

In our Western civilization both words, amateur and sportsman, carry certain connotations of personal integrity, non-professional attitude, and generous sportsmanship, which are utterly unknown to the Communists in connection with the "sports" activities of those athletes whom their governments assign to participate in various international competitions. Yet on May 28, in Munich, the International Olympic Committee, of which Mr. Avery Brundage has been president since 1952, yielded to Soviet blackmail pressures, and ousted Nationalist China from participation in the forthcoming Olympic Games. It did so in order to clear the road for Communist China to compete on its own terms as the "legitimate" representative of all of China. The Committee condescendingly suggested that the Nationalist Chinese might reapply at a later date for admission, as representing Formosa only. This action was taken despite the fact that even the United Nations still recognizes the Nationalist Republic of China as the legitimate and only government of China. So do the United States and about two-thirds of the nations of the remaining "free world" that participate in the Olympic Games. But none of this was good enough for Mr. Brundage and his Olympic Committee. Their betrayal of our

anti-Communist allies in the Republic of China was made, not in accord with or because of, but in spite of, the political realities of the situation.

What is more, Mr. Brundage, while using his exalted position as an "amateur sportsman" to help the political and propaganda schemes of the Soviets, appears deliberately to have given out misinformation about the vote of the Committee. He reported that this vote, to oust Nationalist China, was virtually unanimous. But Douglas Roby, another member of the three-man American representation on the Committee, says that the "vote was taken by a show of hands and in my opinion it was 28 for and 24 against." That's about as unanimous as a bunch of economists' predictions.

A great many anti-Communist organizations and many leading newspapers have strongly protested this action. Even the New York Times, on May 30, in a surprising burst of honest reporting, called it "cowardly, evasive, and shameful." We should certainly add our voice to that protest. The two steps to be demanded are: (1) the resignation of Avery Brundage from the International Olympic Committee; and (2) the rescinding of the vote taken by that Committee on May 28. Unless both demands of an aroused public are complied with, the United States should: (1) withdraw its subsidy of \$400,000 for the Winter Olympics which are scheduled for 1960 in Squaw Valley, California; (2) refuse visas or entrance to the spies and propagandists and professionals whom Red China would send to those Winter Olympics; and (3) withdraw from any future participation in any Olympic Games, anywhere. For both the Olympic Committee and the Olympic Games themselves will have been converted into instrumentalities of the Communist propaganda and political machine.

We suggest that the simplest way for each of our members to express his own protest effectively is through letters to Mr. Avery Brundage, 10 North La Salle Street, Chicago, with carbon copies of those letters to his Congressman and Senators. As to what you say to Avery Brundage, let your conscience and your judgement be your guide. u

5. Besides opposing, in every way we can, both men and measures which aid the Communists, it is important that we also encourage, at every feasible opportunity, those leaders who are bravely battling on our side. One such leader, facing the heaviest odds of every variety which the Communists can contrive, is Jacques Soustelle. From Pages 33 through 46 in the July-August issue of American Opinion, we tell the truth about Soustelle, especially with regard to the problem in Algeria. It is something almost no other magazine in America has done, and we guarantee it is the truth.

But Soustelle has been consistently and at times viciously misrepresented by Look Magazine, Time Magazine, the New York Times, and other left-wing elements of the American press. One piece of fiction parading as fact, concerning the Communist-led Algerian rebel cut-throats, written by a New York Times correspondent, was even planted in the Saturday Evening Post -- which has been occasionally falling for such pro-Communist claptrap ever since the days of Edgar Snow's articles, which glorified the Chinese Communists as good democrats and agrarian reformers. And of course the American government, in ways unobserved or little understood by the American people, has been trying to make Soustelle's anti-Communist road as rough as possible at every turn.

So Jacques Soustelle has no way of knowing that so many of the American people approve and applaud his courageous course. Even the hundred or so questions which our readers asked him, through being generally written in a friendly vein, appeared as a surprising though tiny light of cheering sympathy from a dark realm of misunderstanding. We can do a great deal better to let him know -- or feel -- how strong the anti-Communist sentiment, and support for truly anti-Communist leaders, is in this country, beneath all the blanket of obfuscation with which Communist influences kept it covered. Such encouragement is well worth the effort on our part, and the article in the current American Opinion furnishes an excellent opening for such letters.

We are specifically asking all of our members, therefore, to read the pages in question in the July-August issue. (Remember, gift subscriptions to the magazine, paid for by friends of ours, are still available, simply for the asking, to all members of our Society who do not feel they can afford to subscribe.) This is important information on current events and personalities which you definitely should have anyway, among the weapons in your arsenal of facts. Then we are asking every member who, convinced by the facts, feels willing to act on them, to write at least a short letter to Jacques Soustelle, % American Opinion, Belmont 78, Massachusetts. This is the way you would naturally address your letter, if it were prompted solely by the article in the magazine. We'll see that these are forwarded promptly to Monsieur Soustelle in Paris.

Your letters will be sealed, of course, and we do not even want to know what is in them. But the general theme should be that, regardless of how much he is smeared or his actions distorted by the large-circulation press in this country, there ^{are} an increasing number of Americans who realize that in fighting the Communists and their machinations he is, in the long run, fighting our battle as well as his own; and that you, the writer, just want him to know that he does have many good friends and

strong supporters in that fight, on this side of the Atlantic, despite the way our government or press may make it appear otherwise.

In the crucial months ahead in Europe there are few things more important than the moral support that can be given to Adenauer and to de Gaulle, to encourage them to stand firmly on their own feet against the Communist pressures, despite the "flexibility" of Harold Macmillan and the more subtle "intermediacy" of Christian Herter. And the most effective way for us to strengthen de Gaulle's backbone and anti-Communist determination is to let his firmest anti-Communist associate, Jacques Soustelle, know that our government, in kowtowing to the Kremlin, does not speak for all Americans. A few hundred encouraging and complimentary letters to Jacques Soustelle, from good patriotic Americans right now, could be of psychological and strategic importance far beyond the comparatively small effort required. Will you write one? Please do, promptly. Study the article first, and then put your letter entirely in your own words. But give the man a verbal pat on the back. Goodness knows, like every other real anti-Communist leader everywhere in the world today, he is getting plenty of blows of the other kind.

6. Please read carefully and thoroughly, during July, at least one of the twelve or more books, which your Chapter Leader has as the nucleus of chapter materials, and which you have not read before. We are aware that most of our members are far better informed than the general public on the methods, progress, and menace of the Communist conspiracy. But we are an army fighting with facts as our chief weapons. To acquire still more knowledge, therefore, and more dependable knowledge, is to be better armed. It is a vital part of our work. We have far more direct and comprehensive plans of action than any mere study group, as you are well aware. But the importance of further and continuing study, to every member of every chapter, should be fully realized.

In this connection we are enclosing a very small and thin flyer, entitled THE TEN PILLARS OF ECONOMIC WISDOM, put out by The American Economic Foundation. You will find it excellent -- for reading yourself and for passing on to some "liberal" friend. More copies are available for the asking. From time to time we shall include with these bulletins other carefully selected items, from other groups or other friends in this same fight. We may not even comment on such enclosures, but you can be sure from the very fact of their inclusion that we consider them well worth your time.

7. Keep your eyes, ears, and mind open for any good prospects for further members, in your own chapter or any chapter of The John Birch

Society. Please remember that merely being anti-Communist is not a sufficient qualification. We are far different from, and more than, a political action organization. Our ultimate objective is not only less government and more responsibility, but a better world in every moral and humane sense. We must have associated with us, therefore, only those who will join our own efforts to set an example, by dedication, integrity, and purpose -- in both word and deed -- which men of good will, good conscience, and religious ideals can follow without hesitation.

* * * *

Beginning with this issue, we intend to give an "honorable mention" in each bulletin to that chapter which has done the best job during the month just ending. And we believe that the first of these accolades is deserved by Chapter No. 17, in Tampa, Florida, of which Ken Hardcastle is the Chapter Leader. In getting petitions signed, in following through on all of the details of our other requests, in recruiting for new members, in faithful and prompt and accurate reporting to headquarters, in sustaining an energetic interest in the activities and a strong enthusiasm for the objectives of our Society, Ken Hardcastle's chapter has been setting an excellent example ever since it was formed. We have no medals to bestow, but we do gladly offer these words of appreciation -- as we shall offer similar words to other chapters and their Chapter Leaders in due course.

Let's see that our efforts, our strength, and our accomplishments all grow notably during July. There is much to be done, and happiness in the doing.

Sincerely,

Robert Welch

Date Received 8/31/59
From Chicago
(Name of contributor)
(Address of contributor)

By (Name of Special Agent)
To Be Returned Yes ()
No (☒)

Description: Maps on little island
7 John Birch Society, 7/4/59
File No. 100-32899-12(11)

THE JOHN BIRCH SOCIETY
Belmont 78, Massachusetts

A preliminary and condensed statement

July 4, 1959

What is The John Birch Society?

It is an organization of Americans who have voluntarily joined together: (1) To combat more effectively the evil forces which now threaten our country, our lives and our civilization; (2) to prevail upon our fellow citizens to start pulling out of the deepening morass of collectivism, and then climb up the mountain to higher levels of individual freedom and responsibility than man has ever achieved before; and (3) to restore, with brighter lustre and deeper conviction, the faith inspired morality, the spiritual sense of values, and the gloriously humane traditions, on which our western civilization has been built. The long-range objective of the Society has been officially summarized as less government, more responsibility and a better world.

What is its origin and history?

The John Birch Society was founded by Robert Welch, at a meeting in Indianapolis, on December 9, 1958. It now has local working chapters in six states, and additional chapters are being formed every week. Its immediate goal is fifteen hundred working chapters by December 31, 1959.

There is also a Home Chapter, which maintains contact with its members and coordinates their activities entirely by mail. There are already members of this Home Chapter in about twenty states, and the list includes many of the most influential and highly regarded men and women in our country.

Who is John Birch?

John Birch is dead. He was a young Christian missionary, from a farm near Macon, Georgia, who was in China when we entered World War II. He joined Chennault's forces as a volunteer, organized Chennault's intelligence, rose to the rank of captain in the U.S. Army, and served with unsurpassable bravery and brilliance throughout the war. Ten days after V-J day, while in uniform, on a peaceful and official mission for our government, he was brutally murdered in cold blood by our "allies," the Chinese Communists. You have probably never heard of John Birch, simply because the Communists in Washington planned it that way. We believe that his short but outstanding and memorable life so typifies the best of America that we have named our organization in his memory.

How are chapters of the Society formed?

In order to explain, fully and clearly, the background, methods, and purposes of The John Birch Society, Mr. Welch prefers to hold two-day meetings. For we are digging far more deeply into the problems we face, and building far more solidly in our coordinated effort to overcome the destructive forces around us, than the loose word "organization" is likely to suggest. And many of these full two-day meetings have already been held with small groups in different parts of the country.

But this presentation has also been compressed into a six-hour tape recording, duplicates of which are now being played back to small groups almost every day. (With short recesses, or coffee breaks and a luncheon break, the actual time required is about eight hours.) In this presentation Mr. Welch attempts: (1) To outline the nature and the frightening advance of the threats against our nation, our religion, and our civilization; (2) to evaluate these dangers, and place them in their proper perspective, against the backdrop of world history and the rise of western civilization; (3) to set forth a positive philosophy and program to which men of good will, religious ideals, and humane traditions may rally with confidence and determination; (4) to offer leadership which can make the dedication of such men and women more constructive and more fruitful; and (5), to describe in detail the organization, function, and procedures of The John Birch Society.

Why haven't I heard more about The John Birch Society?

Partly because it is still so young. But mainly because we avoid all publicity as far as is practicable. It is our purpose to build strength and understanding, not to create noise.

What is expected of its members?

A great deal. You should not join The John Birch Society unless you are truly dedicated to the cause of less government, more responsibility, and a better world. Many of the specific actions requested of our members must, necessarily, seem relatively unimportant. But the sum total of them all, faithfully carried out by all of our members, will become increasingly important indeed. Not one of us can be afraid of the drudgery of actual work, for without drudgery all of our dreams are dust.

Enclosed with this memorandum will be a bulletin of the Society for a recent month. That bulletin will make clear, by illustration, some of the specific things, and the kind of things, our members are asked to do. But one bulletin can tell only a small part of the story. And all bulletins together, for many months, would merely emphasize what we want our members to do, without stressing what we want our members to be, which is more important. The ennobling aspects of membership will become apparent only with time, and with a full understanding of the Society's aspirations for its members and itself.

How may I join The John Birch Society?

You may apply for membership in the Home Chapter at any time, by signing the enclosed form and mailing it to us with a year's dues. If the application is not approved, of course your dues will be returned. If it is approved, you will be welcomed into a brotherhood of men and women devoted to an inspiring cause.

As soon as a local working chapter is established in your area, your membership may be transferred to that chapter if you wish. Or if you become sufficiently interested and dedicated to act as a Chapter Leader, and to form a local chapter yourself, we shall be glad to give you all necessary information, guidance, and cooperation.

Date Received _____
From Chicago
(Name of contributor)

(Address of contributor)

By _____ (Name of Special Agent) Yes ()

To Be Returned Yes ()
No (X)

To Be Released To: NO

Description: Item entitled
"Application for Membership"
File No: 100-32899-12 (12)

Application For Membership

....., 195

THE JOHN BIRCH SOCIETY
Belmont 78, Massachusetts

Gentlemen:

This is my application for membership in the Chapter of THE JOHN BIRCH SOCIETY, for one year from this date, and for automatic renewal each year thereafter, unless I resign in writing. I understand the dues schedule printed below, as applicable to myself.

If my application is accepted, I agree that my membership may be revoked at anytime, by a duly appointed officer of the Society, without the reason being stated, on refund of the *pro rata* part of my dues paid in advance.

Sincerely,

(Name)

(Address)

Dues Schedule

Date

Dues Received

Application Approved

By

Title

*Life membership in the Home Chapter, (which automatically covers membership in any local chapter), for men or women \$1,000.00
(This may be paid in two consecutive annual installments of \$500.00 each.)*

*Membership in a local chapter, minimum \$24.00
per year: For men 12.00
For women*

(Applications for membership in local chapters should be approved by the Chapter Leader. Applications for membership in the Home Chapter will be approved by the home office.)

(This may be paid as \$2.00 per month for men, and \$1.00 per month for women, to the local Chapter Leader.)

If any member wishes to pay larger dues, to support the Society's work (or to make contributions for that purpose), such dues or contributions may also be split into monthly installments if desired.